



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/007,256	11/11/2001	Susan Sebata	PA-Y0065	7881

7590 04/29/2003

Joyce Kosinski  
Loral Space and Communications, Ltd.  
Suite 303  
655 Deep Valley Drive  
Rolling Hills Estates, CA 90274

EXAMINER

DINH, TIEN QUANG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3644

DATE MAILED: 04/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Paper No. 11

Application Number: 10/007,256  
Filing Date: November 11, 2001  
Appellant(s): SEBATA ET AL.

MAILED

APR 29 2003

GROUP 3600

---

Mr. Karambelas  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 3/10/03.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Invention**

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Issues**

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

**(7) Grouping of Claims**

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 1-3 do stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

**(8) ClaimsAppealed**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(9) Prior Art of Record**

<u>5787969</u>	Drolen et al	8/1998
4880050	Nakamura et al	11/1989
5755406	Aston et al	5-1998

Art Unit: 3644

**(10) *Grounds of Rejection***

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103. This rejection is set forth in prior Office Action, Paper No. 6.

**(11) *Response to Argument***

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's assertion that the rejection of claims 1-3 is in error. Let's first look at the Drolen et al reference. The Drolen reference shows that a fixed payload radiator 16 is coupled to deployable panels radiator 12. And as can be seen in figure 1, although not numbered, there are heat pipes that connect fixed radiators 18 to panel 16. The Examiner has submitted a marked up copy showing where these un-numbered heat pipes are located. Although it is notoriously well known to one skilled in the art that heat pipes are well known to transfer heat from an overheated surface to a cooler surface, the Examiner has used the Nakamura et al reference to show that heat pipes to transfer heat from one panel to another panel on the opposite side is well known in the art. Furthermore, since the deployable radiator panels 12 and 14 are connected to their respectively payload radiator 16 and 18 (in Drolen et al's system), heat from the fixed panels is thermally coupled to the deployable panels. With Drolen et al in view of Nakamura et al, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have transferred heat from an overheated panel to a cooler panel (which includes a deployable radiator panel) on the opposite side so as to prevent massive heat buildup on one side of the spacecraft to prevent damages. Thus the rejection is valid and correct. As for the Aston et al reference, Aston et al was used to teach that solar panels are well known in the satellite art.

Therefore, it would have obvious to one skilled in the art to have used solar panels to generate powers.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

  
TD

April 23, 2003

Conferees  
CJ  
JWE

Joyce Kosinski  
Loral Space and Communications, Ltd.  
Suite 303  
655 Deep Valley Drive  
Rolling Hills Estates, CA 90274

FIG. 1

